



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

verloren gegangen. Deshalb durfte man sie in der Orthographie mit einander vertauschen. In dem Worte *daz* wurde das *z* zu dieser Zeit wahrscheinlich wie germanisches *s* ausgesprochen und wenn der Schreiber im *Liedersaal* die Konjunktion sorgfältig mit *s*, die Pronominalform dagegen mit *z* schreibt, ist das nur ein willkürlicher Versuch den syntaktischen Unterschied der beiden Redeteile in der Orthographie zu bezeichnen. Früher freilich, zur Blütezeit der M. H. D. Dichtung, reimte kein sorgfältiger Dichter ein nach Vokalen aus germanischem *t* verschobenes *z* mit einem rein germanischen *s*, was einen Unterschied in der Aussprache beweist. Später aber verschwand allmählich dieser Unterschied und die beiden Laute gingen in einander über. Dieses *z* und *s* bezeichneten nunmehr einfach denselben Laut und deshalb durften sie in der Orthographie einander vertreten. Dieser orthographische Unterschied beim Schreiber des *Widertail* im *Liedersaal* ist eine Feinheit, die ihre Parallele in der N. H. D. Orthographie findet, wo die Konjunktion mit *ss*, die Pronominalform aber mit einfachem *s* geschrieben wird, während doch kein Unterschied in der Aussprache besteht.

Aus dieser Übersicht des Konsonantensystems bei Lassberg und bei Primisser ersieht man, dass das oberdeutsche Gepräge bei Primisser stärker bewahrt ist als bei Lassberg. Wenn man sowohl dies in Betracht zieht als dass das Vokalsystem bei Primisser bairisch ist, so darf man annehmen, dass die Sinzendorf-Thurn'sche Handschrift der ursprünglichen Fassung des *Widertail* näher gelegen hat als die des *Liedersaal*, während die Lesart bei Lassberg im *Liedersaal* eine auf alemannischem Boden umgearbeitete Form der ursprünglichen Handschrift gewesen sein muss.¹ Spuren des Bairischen sind noch in den Flexionsendungen zu bemerken, was meine Theorie bestätigt, dass die ursprüngliche Form des Gedichtes bairisch sei. Dialektische Unterschiede in den Flexionsendungen sind bei weitem nicht so auffallend, wie

Unterschiede in den Stammsilben, daher machte der Schreiber im *Liedersaal* in erster Linie die Stammsilben alemannisch, vernachlässigte aber gewissermassen die Flexionsendungen. Merkwürdig ist es jedoch, dass die Lesart bei Prim., welche sonst ganz bairisch ist, die bairischen Eigentümlichkeiten in den Flexionsendungen nicht so ausgeprägt aufweist, wie die alemannische Lesart bei Lassberg; aber das kann man schon der Abschwächung der Endungen zuschreiben.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

“THE HISTORY OF CARDENIO BY MR. FLETCHER AND SHAKESPEARE.”

In 1653 there was entered on the Stationers' Register for Humphrey Moseley a play described as “The History of Cardenio by Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare.” We learn from the accounts of Lord Stanhope of Harrington that on May 20th, 1613, John Hemings (Heminge), one of the leading actors among the King's men (Shakespeare's company), was paid for presenting six several plays (some of them Shakespeare's best), among which was one called “Cardano” or “Cardenno”; and later he was paid for presenting, on June 8th of the same year, before the Duke of Savoy's ambassador, a play called “Cardema” or “Cardenna.” I find also, what seems to have been hitherto overlooked, that Chamberlain, writing to Carleton, on June 10th, 1613, of the gay doings of this same Savoy ambassador, says: “On Tuesday [June 8th] he was at the Lord Mayor's, where, besides all other cheer, they had a play.” In all probability this play was the one for which Hemings was paid and the one which Moseley in 1653 attributed to Fletcher and Shakespeare. Other traces of it there have seemed to be none. Fleay attempted to identify it with *Love's Pilgrimage*, but by a process of reasoning with which no one but Fleay could have been satisfied.

In 1727 Lewis Theobald, hero of the *Dunciad* and one of the ablest of the early editors of Shakespeare, produced a play both on the stage

¹ In seinem vortrefflichen Aufsatz über die Suchenwirt-Handschriften (vgl. oben die Bibliographie) bemerkt Herr Kratochwil (S. 223), dass der Schreiber von A (d. h. der Sinzendorf-Thurn'schen Handschrift) dem bairisch-österreichischen Sprachgebiete gehöre und weiter (S. 462) dass die Sprache, des *Widertail* im *Liedersaal* alemannisch sei. Er führt aber keinen Beweis dafür.

and in print, which he called *Double Falsehood*, or *The Distressed Lovers*, and professed to have revised from old manuscripts of a play of Shakespeare. *Double Falsehood* is founded on the story of Cardenio in *Don Quixote*. It was very successful as an acting piece and was revived frequently during the eighteenth century. In its printed form it went almost immediately into a second edition and was again reprinted in 1767. The copyright of the play was secured to Theobald by royal license on the ground "that he had, at a considerable expense, purchased the ms. copy of an original play of William Shakespeare, called 'Double Falsehood, or The Distressed Lovers'; and had, with great labour and pains, revised and adapted the same for the stage."

In the preface to the first edition Theobald says: "It has been alledg'd as incredible, that such a Curiosity should be stifled and lost to the World for above a Century. To This my Answer is short; that tho' it never till now made its Appearance on the Stage, yet one of the Manuscript Copies, which I have, is of above Sixty Years Standing, in the Handwriting of Mr. Downes, the famous Old Prompter; and, as I am credibly inform'd, was early in the Possession of the celebrated Mr. Betterton, and by Him design'd to have been usher'd into the World. What Accident prevented This Purpose of his, I do not pretend to know: Or thro' what hands it had successively pass'd before that Period of Time. There is a Tradition (which I have from the Noble Person, who supply'd me with One of my Copies) that it was given by our Author, as a Present of Value, to a Natural Daughter of his, for whose Sake he wrote it, in the Time of his Retirement from the Stage. Two other Copies I have (one of which I was glad to purchase at a very good Rate), which may not, perhaps, be quite so Old as the Former; but One of Them is much more perfect, and has fewer Flaws and Interruptions in the Sense. . . .

"Others again, to depreciate the Affair, as they thought, have been pleased to urge, that tho' the Play may have some Resemblances of *Shakespeare*, yet the *Colouring*, *Diction*, and *Characters*, come nearer to the Style and Manner of *Fletcher*. This, I think, is far from deserving any Answer; I submit it to the Determination of better Judgments; tho' my Partiality for *Shakespeare* makes me wish, that Every Thing which is good, or pleasing, in our Tongue, had been owing to his Pen."

The question then arises: was *Double Falsehood*

founded on the old *Cardenio*? That is, was Theobald really in possession of manuscripts of that play or did he invent the whole story? We first ask, naturally, what became of the manuscripts? There is no answer. We learn from the *Variorum Shakespeare* (I, 178) that Theobald's library, containing a large number of old plays, was sold in 1744, shortly after his death. About 1750 Warburton's cook destroyed, among other treasures, "a play by Will. Shakespeare." Fleay, without any thought of "Double Falsehood," seems to have been inclined to identify this lost play with "Cardenio." It is at least possible that Warburton may have come into possession of one or more of Theobald's copies. Theobald's edition of Shakespeare was published after *Double Falsehood* and we may wonder why he did not include the *Cardenio* play. He may, however, not have cared to disturb his own copyright, or he may have wished to avoid unpleasant comparisons, or he may have himself felt some doubt as to his traditional settlement of the authorship. As Professor Lounsbury points out, Theobald refers at least once in the Shakespeare to *Double Falsehood* (Vol. iv, page 287, note), which seems to imply that he himself continued to take the play seriously.

Dispute about the authorship began with the first production and has not ceased. Some contemporaries treated the play as pure forgery of Theobald and he did not show much tact in defending himself; for when certain lines were picked out as especially fine, he insisted that those were precisely the ones he had written. Pope attacked the play for the sake of attacking Theobald, but afterwards admitted that he regarded it as a genuine product of Shakespeare's age. Dr. Farmer maintained that it could not be Shakespeare's, because "aspect" was accented on the first syllable, forgetting that Theobald confessed to having revised the original with "great labour and pains." Farmer thought the play Shirley's, because Langbaine tells us that author left several plays in ms. and "from every mark of style and manner I make no doubt of ascribing it to Shirley." I have myself studied Shirley's plays carefully and I detect none of these "marks of style and manner" in *Double Falsehood*. Dyce followed Farmer, adding the purely gratuitous hypothesis, since sometimes ac-

cepted as fact, that Theobald was misled by the letters "Sh." on the title-page. Malone is said to have attributed the play to Massinger, which would require confirmation. Professor Ward is inclined to accept Farmer's and Dyce's suggestion of Shirley. Mr. Oliphant thinks *Double Falsehood* contains "nothing that could have been written by Fletcher or Shakespeare." Mr. Sidney Lee says, "there is nothing in the play as published by Theobald to suggest Shakespeare's hand, but Theobald doubtless took advantage of a tradition that Shakespeare and Fletcher had combined to dramatise the Cervantic theme"; and Professor Schelling agrees with Mr. Lee. Churton Collins, who probably knew Theobald's work better than anyone else, believed that *Double Falsehood* "was founded on some old play" but that it was, for the most part, "from Theobald's own pen." I find no indication that Collins was aware of the facts in regard to the original *Cardenio*, and there is apparently no mention of them in Professor Lounsbury's otherwise most careful and thorough discussion of *Double Falsehood* and its author. Professor Lounsbury concludes: "We can consequently feel safe in dismissing the supposition that the piece was the composition of Theobald himself." And I think we may say decidedly that this conclusion has the great body of critical authority behind it.

Now let us turn to the play. The action follows closely the story of Cervantes, but with interesting divergences. The most notable of these is the introduction of Roderick, the elder brother of Henriquez (the Don Fernando of Cervantes), who plays the part of Don Quixote in the original, so far as to be the main agent in solving difficulties and finally bringing the right lovers together. The scene of Leonora's (originally Lucinda's) marriage (III, 2) is skilfully made the climax of the play and is handled with excellent effect for dramatic purposes by letting Julio (Cardenio) actually take part, as he does not in the original. Act V is also largely varied from the Cardenio story and is developed in a series of telling climaxes, exactly such as were always dear to Fletcher's heart. This is most notable when taken in connection with Professor Thorndike's analysis and comparison of Beaumont and Fletcher's and Shakespeare's romances and especially with what he says of the dénouements of those

romances. It is worth remarking that betrayal of friendship forms the subject of *Double Falsehood*, as of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, which probably contains work of both Shakespeare and Fletcher, and that the madness of the jailor's daughter in that play has its counterpart in the madness of Julio (*Double Falsehood*, IV). Let me also note here that Miss Hatcher, in her excellent monograph on Fletcher, points out how fond he was of going to Cervantes for his plots (probably in ten plays) and how closely he follows his original.

There are some interesting points in characterization. Violante (Cervantes's Dorothea), in her boy disguise, is exactly the familiar figure of the Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher romances. And if any one cries out against naming her with Elizabethan heroines, I can only say that such a critic can have reflected little on the all-importance of style in creating and distinguishing dramatic characters. Let Emily and Arcite, or even Imogen and Posthumous, be revised "with great pains and labour" by a Theobald, and they would soon sink to the level of Violante and Henriquez. The most curious elements in this character study, however, are the two old fathers, Camillo and Don Bernard. There is no hint of either in the original and they are exactly the types of garrulous, waspish, fretful, pompous old men, which Fletcher so greatly loved (*Elder Brother*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, *Pilgrim*, *Maid in the Mill*, etc.).

But the question of style in *Double Falsehood* is more important than that of character. In the first two acts and III, 1 and 2, we find everywhere the predominance of Theobald. It is clear that, especially in II, he has conscientiously and minutely revised and altered, levelling and flattening everything to the eighteenth century commonplace which rules unbroken in his own acknowledged dramas. Yet through this obscuring haze no one who reads carefully can fail to distinguish another touch, firm, vivid, masculine, high-wrought, imaginative, all the more marked for standing out so strongly against the emptiness that surrounds it. This touch is either that of an Elizabethan or a most skilful imitation, and surely anyone who could have imitated so successfully, would have made his imitation more sustained. What Elizabethan, however, it is not possible to say with positiveness.

The case is altogether different when we come to III, 3. Here, although it has so far escaped the notice of editors and critics, it seems to me that we at once detect another hand which has not appeared before in the play, the most individual of all Elizabethan hands, the hand which no one at all familiar with it should mistake, the hand of Fletcher. Fletcher's manner is, indeed, easily imitable; but, as I shall show later, it is almost impossible to suppose that Theobald imitated it; and if he did not, I cannot see how we can avoid the conclusion that, still under Theobald's revision, we have much of Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*.

I do not lay great stress on the mere fact of feminine endings, although an examination of the different scenes which I had attributed, on independent grounds, to Fletcher and to his fellow author, shows 47% of double endings in Fletcher's portion and only 32% in the remainder. Of course, owing to Theobald's revision, this is much less than Fletcher's usual percentage. Nevertheless the difference is significant. Double endings are common enough, however, in Theobald's plays and in eighteenth century tragedy generally. We come nearer to Fletcher when we have frequent double endings formed of two words,—

"Yes, I am that Lord Roderick, and I lie not."—III, 3;
 "She's stol'n away; and whither gone, I know not."—
 III, 3;

much nearer, when the last word is a "now," or a "too," or a "yet,"—

"Make up your Malice, and dispatch his Life too."—
 III, 3;
 "I hope to see that Day before I dye yet."—III, 3.

nearest of all in the peculiarly Fletcherian trick of ending a line with a word which should be emphasized and rhythmically cannot be,—

"Pr'thee, be gone, and bid the Bell knoll for me;"—
 III, 3.

And there is more in it than mere metre. Everyone who knows Fletcher knows his passion for alliteration and his extraordinary gift in the use of it. It is abundant in his portion of this play. Note it in the lines quoted above for another purpose. Note it, with other peculiarities, for example, the parentheses, in this charming and most Fletcherian passage, which I cannot but think that Theobald has altogether spared:—

"Julio. Since she is not Leonora, she is heav'nly.
 When she speaks next, listen as seriously,
 As Women do that have their Loves at Sea,
 What Wind blows ev'ry Morning—

Violante. I cannot get this false Man's Memory
 Out of my Mind. You Maidens, that shall live
 To hear my mournful Tale, when I am Ashes,
 Be wise: and to an Oath no more give Credit,
 To Tears, to Vows, (false Both!) or any Thing
 A Man shall promise, than to Clouds, that now
 Bear such a pleasing Shape, and now are
 nothing.
 For they will cozen, (if They may be cozen'd,)
 The very Gods they worship."—IV, 2.

Further, one of Fletcher's most marked mannerisms is his habit of repeating words, sometimes again and again, leaving them and going back to them. Where in *The Humorous Lieutenant* or *The Chances* will you find a better example of this than the following, which in other respects also is perfect Fletcher:—

"Violante. How his Eyes shake Fire,
 And measure ev'ry Piece of Youth about me!
 The Ewes want water, Sir: Shall I go drive 'em
 Down to the Cisterns? Shall I make haste, Sir?
 'Would I were five Miles from him—How he
 gripes me!
 Master. Come, Come, all this is not sufficient, Child,
 To make a Fool of me.—*This is a fine Hand,*
A delicate fine Hand,—Never change Colour:
 You understand me,—and *A Woman's Hand.*"
 —IV, 1.

Parallel passages are misleading. Fletcher, however, was fond of repeating his fine things and it is quite striking that the cloud line in the last quotation but one should so closely resemble that in Ordella's noble speech (*Thierry and Theodoret*, IV, 1)—

"And fly, like shapes of clouds we form, to nothing."

Other cloud figures, less conspicuously similar, might be produced.

More general coincidences of diction are also noticeable. For instance, the adverb "extremely," occurring twice in this play, is a favorite with Fletcher. It occurs only five times in all Shakespeare, two of those being in the Fletcherian *Henry VIII*. It is found at least twenty-eight times in Fletcher, and in two plays, *The Humorous Lieutenant* and *Monsieur Thomas*, five times each. Another favorite word is "now," in an almost redundant use, often vexatiously frequent in Fletcher's acknowledged plays, and very com-

mon in *Double Falsehood*. See, for example, page 35 of that play.

These marked Fletcher peculiarities, then, do not appear at all before III, 3. In that scene they are abundant. Fletcher's also is the speech of the shepherds at the beginning of IV, but the business of Julio's madness takes us back to the firmer, stronger hand :—

"It puzzles my Philosophy, to think
That the rude Blast, hot Sun, and dashing Rains
Have made no fiercer War upon thy Youth."

—IV, 1.

No Fletcher there. With the entrance of Violante, however, Fletcher comes again and has the remainder of scene 1, the whole of 2, and probably the first scene of V—that is, so far as Theobald will permit. V, 2, the long and skilful dénouement, has indubitable traces of the more masculine author and of Fletcher also. It is worth noting that the comic business of the two old men appears in the earlier acts in prose, then is transformed into Fletcher's comic verse, and in V returns partially to prose again.

We have, then, in *Double Falsehood* a play on a subject supposed to have been treated by Shakespeare and Fletcher, containing in one portion many Elizabethan touches quite different from Fletcher, in another distinct portion many more touches so Fletcherian that it is difficult to believe them not Fletcher's, unless we suspect deliberate and most skilful imitation. Now either Theobald did really revise the play from old manuscripts or he forged it. Let us assume the forgery. That he should have forged such a play as I have described above, with no knowledge of the Shakespeare-Fletcher-Cardenio tradition, presupposes coincidences which are manifestly impossible. But did he know of the Cardenio tradition? It seems to me in the highest degree unlikely. Our sole knowledge of that tradition rests on two facts: Lord Harrington's record as to the acting in 1613 and the Stationers' entry in 1653. Now Theobald declares in his preface that the play had never been acted, which seems to dispose of Lord Harrington. As to the Stationers' entry, Mr. Arber tells us that the registers were not extensively consulted until well into the eighteenth century and it appears hardly likely that even Malone, fifty years later than Theobald, knew of the Cardenio entry, since he quotes the Lord Harrington

passage and speaks of *Cardenio* as acted in 1613, but does not show the most distant sign of associating that play with either Shakespeare or Fletcher. There is still stronger evidence, however. If Theobald knew of the tradition, and deliberately set out to forge a Shakespeare-Fletcher play, how could he possibly have neglected to bring forward such an argument? Instead of doing so, he writes the paragraph, quoted at the beginning of this paper, in which he deprecates the suggestion of Fletcher authorship which had been brought forward by his critics (a suggestion of extreme interest, by the way, as showing the early detection of Fletcher in the play by persons who had no reason whatever to look for him there). This paragraph seems to me absolutely incompatible with any possibility of Theobald's having set himself deliberately to imitate Fletcher. I do not see, then, how we can avoid the conclusion that Theobald was really in possession of an old play, and that, in view of its subject and of Fletcher's part authorship, that play was "*The History of Cardenio*."

Now is there reason to believe that "*The History of Cardenio*" had any connection with Shakespeare? For external evidence we have Moseley's attribution to "Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare" in 1653; but Moseley was far from reliable. We have Theobald's tradition, which is worth little, but something. And we have the fact that the play, "*Cardenno*" or "*Cardenna*" (if identical with "*The History of Cardenio*") was acted by the King's men in 1613 with other of Shakespeare's and Fletcher's greatest plays about the precise time when, if ever, Shakespeare and Fletcher would have been in close connection. This seems to suggest the possibility that *The History of Cardenio* might come into the same class with *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

The internal evidence is certainly not of great importance. Numerous passages resembling Shakespeare's acknowledged work of the period to which *The History of Cardenio* would belong, can be produced; but none is close enough to have much weight.

Many lines and phrases in the non-Fletcherian portion of the play have, to my ear something of a Shakespearean turn or resonance, as distinguished from either Beaumont or Massinger, the

writers who would have been most likely to have collaborated with Fletcher :—

"You deal unkindly ; misbecomingly,
I'm loth to say : For All that waits on you,
Is graced and graces."—I, 2 ;

"Such a Villany
A Writer could not put down in his Scene,
Without Taxation of his Auditory
For Fiction most enormous."—III, 1.

Again, we have examples of that use of strange words, or words in strange connections, which is so characteristic of the later Shakespeare :—

"Young Lords, like you,
Have thus *besung* mean Windows, rhymed their Sufferings
Even to the Abuse of Things Divine."—I, 3 ;

"Home, my Lord,
What you can say, is most unseasonable, what sing
Most *absonant* and harsh."—I, 3.

And if anyone urges that not even the greatest labor and pains of a Theobald could have obliterated Shakespeare so successfully, we can only point to the extraordinary habits of revisers generally which could make even so true a poet and so genuine a Shakespearean as D'Avenant write, apparently with the idea that he was improving his model,—

"Duncan is dead.
He, after life's short fever now sleeps well.
Treason has done its worst ; nor steel nor poison,
Nor foreign force, nor yet domestic malice
Can touch him further."

The fact that Theobald's revision is much less evident in Fletcher's part of the play than in the other, would be easily accounted for if he had in one case to deal with the rugged, vigorous, difficult thought of Shakespeare's later period, in the other with Fletcher's fluent theatrical rhetoric, and if we remember that the revision was intended for the stage.

As regards dramatic handling, two points are worth noting. First, in *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* Shakespeare—if it was Shakespeare—began the play and Fletcher, perhaps working out Shakespeare's sketches, appears mainly in the latter part. The same is true of the relation of the two authors in *Double Falsehood*. Second, in the three romances of Shakespeare's last period, *A Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *Cymbeline*, as well as in *Pericles*, an important element of the dénouement is the common romantic theme of the restoration of lost

children to their parents, and in *Cymbeline* this forms the main part of the series of most telling climaxes, piled one upon another, which constitutes act v, scene 5. Now in the last act of *Double Falsehood* we have this same motive developed also in a series of most telling climaxes ; and curiously enough this is accomplished by departing entirely from the original story in "Don Quixote," which is otherwise followed with considerable minuteness.

All these arguments are certainly far from sufficient to associate Shakespeare's name in any positive fashion with *The History of Cardenio*, not to speak of *Double Falsehood* as it stands. But it seems to me that there is a certain interest in discovering the remains of a play which was almost indisputably Fletcher's, which had at least some claim to be classed among Fletcher's collaborations with his greatest predecessor, and which would in that case form a most important link in the masterly chain of argument by which Professor Thorndike has connected Shakespeare's work with that of his younger friends and rivals.

I hope before long to reprint *Double Falsehood* with an introduction and notes which will give my argument fuller and more substantial development.

GAMALIEL BRADFORD, JR.

Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Pepita Jiménez, by JUAN VALERA, edited with notes and vocabulary by G. L. LINCOLN. Boston : D. C. Heath & Co., 1908. xii + 245 pp.

A school edition of Valera's great novel has long been a desideratum, and while the present edition abounds in faults of detail, it may be profitably used in college classes near the end of the second year. In the reviewer's opinion, this story should not be read earlier, since a class-room test shows it to be, both in vocabulary and thought, decidedly more difficult than *José, El Sombrero de tres Picos*, or Becquer's *Legends*. Then, too, the action is so slow that it is better to read it when the class can prepare an assignment of ten pages or more.

The Introduction is adequate, and assigns Valera his proper place among the Spanish novelists. The sketch of his life might properly have contained the interesting item that he was blind